

# **WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM REDESIGN MEETING –Agenda –August 11, 2004**

Location: In Person: SCR Hdqtrs, Gathering Waters Room

Present: Sue Bangert, Barb Hennings, Frank Schultz, John Melby, Connie Antonuk, Larry Lynch, Dave Hildreth, Cynthia Moore, Dennis Mack, Mike Degen, Deb Pingel (Phone)

Note taker: Larry Lynch

Time	Presenter	Topic		Decision	Follow-up
9:00 am	Sue B	Agenda Repair, Check-in, Notes from 8/2		The notes from the 8/2/04 conference call were approved.	Barb will finalize the notes, incorporating a link or a reference to the WaMT site for access to the issue papers and get them posted on the web site.
9:15	Kevin Kessler	Historic Statutory Context of the Waste Management Program		Kevin Kessler presented his perspective on the redesign effort with an emphasis on the history of the program and its underlying statutory framework. Kevin suggested that it might be beneficial for the program and its stakeholders to evaluate the statutes to assess whether there are portions of the laws that are outdated and/or serve as obstacles to effective program implementation. He cited a number of issues to illustrate his point including, the Siting Law, exemption and waiver provisions, limitations on beneficial use, lack of integration between the solid waste and recycling statutes and the overall approach of regulating facilities as opposed to wastes or activities. The ensuing discussion addressed the process for pursuing statutory changes, the need for strong partners and the risks involved in such a process. The team recognizes that it is likely some statutory changes may be needed to fully implement the redesigned program and that we should not necessarily view that as a limitation when we consider various options for program redesign.	
9:45	ALL	Updates: Meetings w/Legislators; AWMT Update (8/4/04); Input from other		Sue, Cynthia and John reported on their recent meeting with Rep. Johnsrud. Rep.	Cynthia will try to establish dates to meet with other

		programs/agencies		<p>Johnsrud indicated that he has not heard of many issues related to solid waste-related matters in his district. He did however offer several points for the department to keep in mind as we move forward. First, he stressed that we must stay cognizant of the fact that rural parts of the state are truly different, specifically in terms of economics, culture and many other aspects. Second, burn barrels and illegal dumping are significant issues in rural settings but he also understands the rationale for the department's efforts on these issues. He suggested that there is a great need for improved collection services in rural areas. Lastly, he emphasized the value of continued outreach efforts, both with the general public and the legislature. He would welcome regular discussions with the department and believes other legislators would as well.</p> <p>Dave and Dennis summarized the discussion from the AWMT meeting. They reported that there are a lot of rumors and misconceptions regarding the redesign. The AWMT has a definite interest in the redesign and would like some role in the development and approval of the redesign plan. We discussed specific points in our timeline at which the AWMT should have input.</p> <p>The team also briefly discussed soliciting input from other department programs, state programs and EPA.</p>	<p>legislators (e.g., Kedzie, Cowles, Stepp, Roessler). Team members from the Madison area will participate in the meetings, as available.</p> <p>The redesign team will try to address some of the bigger rumors (e.g., the goal of redesign is to re-centralize the program.) as opportunities occur, such as the upcoming staff meetings. The timeline will be fleshed out to incorporate input from the AWMT at various points including development of the needs analysis and final implementation plan.</p> <p>Sue will forward a list of questions and issues to the appropriate parties asking for input.</p>
9:45	Connie Antonuk, Larry Lynch	<p>Benchmarking – What have other states experienced in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenges</li> </ul>		<p>Connie and Larry summarized their findings regarding solid waste management programs in other states. Connie reported on</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities</li> <li>• Successes</li> </ul>		<p>Minnesota and Ohio while Larry discussed Washington and Massachusetts. With the exception of Ohio, each of these states has experienced budget and staff reductions. Generally, the states have responded to these reductions by focusing their effort on larger, higher risk facilities and activities. It seems that Washington has taken the most concrete steps to actually streamline some of their permitting activities by allowing some general permits, expanded exemptions, permit deferral and multi-function permits for lower risk facilities. Larry also reported that Texas and Colorado are initiating pilot programs using an EMS to address operating plans at landfills and as replacements for traditional environmental respectively.</p> <p>Barb mentioned some information from Iowa that really hit home for her. Specifically, on the web site <a href="http://iowa.regov.org/qanda_archive/question.jsp?top=17&amp;siteObjectID=50">http://iowa.regov.org/qanda_archive/question.jsp?top=17&amp;siteObjectID=50</a>, there is a discussion of the term “customer” in the context of a regulatory agency that distinguishes “complier”(regulated entities) from “customer” (society in general). Barb suggested that staff is uncomfortable considering and referring to regulated entities as customers and that we should try to avoid using that term in our work. The team discussed its own perception of the terms customer, customer service and stakeholders. The team recognizes that the environment and society are our true “customers” and agreed that we should be careful in how we use various terms in the future.</p>	<p>The issue of the use of the term “customer” was put in the parking lot for future discussion.</p>
10:45	John Melby; ALL	Building Blocks – What do we use from the building blocks that will result in successful redesign		<p>John reported that the summaries of the Building Blocks documents have mostly been completed. The building blocks are already available on the web site. The ensuing discussion concluded that the</p>	<p>Mike will develop an introductory statement that puts the building block documents into proper context and forward it to Barb. Barb will then have</p>

				summary document would be useful as well, and should be available on our web site.	the introduction, the summaries and links to the full documents put on the redesign web site.
11:45	<b>LUNCH</b>	<b>BRING YOUR OWN</b>			
12:30pm	Mike Degen, Deb Pingel, ALL	<p>Focus Group Sessions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizing &amp; Grouping messages heard</li> <li>Proposed way to guide discussions at next weeks' redesign meetings (identifying redesign initiatives)</li> </ul>		<p>The team discussed a draft summary document that tried to capture the many messages heard at the external and internal focus group sessions. The summary categorized all of the comments under 6 main headings. This document was compiled as a tool to help focus the discussion at the follow-up meetings with staff and will also be useful in development of the needs matrix. It was generally felt that the six categories (organization, program management, communication, trust, funding and process) were appropriate but that for our immediate needs should only include statements of concern and should not include suggested solutions. . (The suggested solutions will be captured on a separate summary and later incorporated into a solutions matrix.)</p> <p>The team considered different alternatives for managing the upcoming staff meetings to ensure they are effective and worthwhile. It was agreed that the meetings would consist of three main parts, an introduction to provide context, address "big" rumors and reiterate the redesign criteria, an exercise to refine and prioritize the concerns and a period to identify and discuss potential solutions and recommendations in the context of program redesign.</p>	<p>Team members should review the focus group comment summaries and the overall summary document to ensure that the overall summary includes all significant concerns and that the recommended solutions are removed. Cynthia will distribute the revised comprehensive summary in the next couple of days to staff.</p> <p>Team members should try to attend at least one of the follow-up meetings with staff.</p>
2:15	ALL	Next Meeting (8/20/04) – Relocate?? Assignments		The meeting scheduled for August 20 <sup>th</sup> was canceled and rescheduled for August 31 <sup>st</sup> . The meeting will start at 9:30 and will be held in the Raptor Room at the SCR office.	Potential agenda items for the next meeting include information from the follow-up staff meetings, revision of the

				The small group dealing with the staff input sessions will meet on August 20 <sup>th</sup> in Madison.	needs matrix, identifying targets, revision of the redesign timeline and revisiting the “things to consider doing” list.
2:30		ADJOURN – Safe Travels Home			Parking lot issues from this meeting included the use of the term “customers” when referring to regulated entities, the “us vs. them” attitude that seems to have developed in the program and the list of questions from staff generated from one of the focus group meetings.